



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC.  
500 FIFTH AVENUE  
SUITE 1600  
NEW YORK NY 10110

**COPY MAILED**

**JAN 23 2007**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Steven Paul Georges Cooremans :  
et al. :  
Application No. 09/995,321 : DECISION ON RENEWED PETITION  
Filed: November 27, 2001 : UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)  
Attorney Docket Number: :  
10008.200-US :  
Title: AUTOMATED MECHANICAL :  
STRESS ASSAY FOR SCREENING :  
CLEANING INGREDIENTS :

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed December 14, 2006, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)<sup>1</sup>, to revive the above-identified application.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action, mailed January 24, 2006, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No response was received, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) were requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on April 25, 2006. A notice of abandonment was mailed August 9, 2006.

<sup>1</sup> A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

1. The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
2. The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(m);
3. A statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional, and;
4. Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

The original petition was filed on August 4, 2006, and was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on December 11, 2006.

With this renewed petition, Petitioner has indicated that continuation application 11/474,593 was filed on June 26, 2006 (Application No. 11/474,593 is not a *continuation* of the present application, but rather is a divisional - this appears to be a typographical error).

It is noted in passing that the original petition made no mention of the filing of a divisional application, and instead asserted erroneously "the proposed response...is attached."

Since this application is being revived for purposes of continuity only and since continuity has been established by this decision reviving the application, the present application is again abandoned in favor of divisional Application No. 11/474,593.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.



Paul Shanoski  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions  
United States Patent and Trademark Office